

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/908,941	07/20/2001	Masaki Hirase	010917	1043
23850 7.	23850 7590 .10/26/2004		EXAMINER	
ARMSTRONG, KRATZ, QUINTOS, HANSON & BROOKS, LLP 1725 K STREET, NW			KENNEDY, JENNIFER M	
SUITE 1000			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
WASHINGTO	WASHINGTON, DC 20006			<del>-</del>
			DATE MAILED: 10/26/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Advisory Action	09/908,941	HIRASE ET AL.			
Auvisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Jennifer M. Kennedy	2812			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
THE REPLY FILED FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.					
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]				
a) The period for reply expires 3_months from the mailing date of b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adv event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).	sory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of	the final rejection.			
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The dathave been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extens 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three moleaned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	sion and the corresponding amount of the statutory period for reply originally set in	fee. The appropriate extension fee under the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in			
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR					
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:					
(a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);					
(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);					
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or					
(d) they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.					
NOTE:					
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject					
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).					
5. The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet					
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which were newly			
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we					
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:					
Claim(s) allowed:					
Claim(s) objected to:					
Claim(s) rejected: <u>3-10</u> .					
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <u>1-2</u> .					
8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.					
9. $\square$ Note the attached Information Disclosure Stateme	nt(s)( PTO-1449)	·			
10. ☐ Other:		Jennifer M. Kennedy Patent Examiner Art Unit: 2812			

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 11-03) Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicants' arguments are not persuasive. Applicants argue that Figures 3A and 5A of Zhang et al. disagree with each other since Figure 3A discloses the mask does not fully cover the element partitioning trench, while Figure 5A discloses the mask does fully cover the element partitioning trench. Applicants argue that Figure 3A is a correct figure, while Figure 5A is incorrect. The examiner notes that the reference patent is available for all that it fairly discloses to one of ordinary skill in the art, regardless of what is claimed. In re Bowers, 359 F.2d 886, 149 USPQ 570 (CCPA 1966). The examiner submits that Zhang et al., in Figure 5A, fairly discloses to one of ordinary skill in the art that the mask may fully cover the element partitioning trench. Further, the examiner notes that the purpose of the mask is to remove the oxide outside of the STI regions. If the mask of Zhang et al. did not cover the STI regions fully then the oxide within the trench would be etched, creating unwanted divots.